

REMARKS

Claims 8, 9 and 11 to 17 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 9 and 11 to 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,485,520 ("Chaum") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,073,062 ("Hoshino").

Claim 8 relates to a method for posting debit information to a mobile integrated circuit card using a terminal, the terminal being in a wireless, secure communication with a computer, the method including performing a mutual dynamic authenticity test between the computer, the terminal and the integrated circuit card using at least one data word, the at least one data word constantly changing, generating, by one of the computer and the terminal, the debit information, transmitting a first data word of the at least one data word from the integrated circuit card to the terminal before an interrupt-sensitive time period, the first data word being generated for the mutual dynamic authenticity test, transmitting a particular signal from the terminal to the integrated circuit card during the interrupt-sensitive time period, the particular signal including a posting triggering signal, a posting data record, an identifier generated using the first data word and a second data word of the at least one data word generated by one of the computer and the terminal, checking, by the integrated circuit card, the identifier, posting, by the integrated circuit card, the debit information as a function of the posting data record, generating, by the integrated circuit card, a further identifier as a function of the second data word, and transmitting a confirmation signal and the further identifier from the integrated circuit card to the computer via the terminal, the confirmation signal being provided to indicate that the debit information has been posted, the confirmation signal being transmitted from the terminal to the computer one of during and outside of the interrupt-sensitive time period.

It is respectfully submitted that Chaum and Hoshino, either alone or combined, do not disclose all of the features of claim 8, for the reasons stated in Applicants' Amendment of May 19, 2006, and for the following further reasons.

In particular, Chaum does not disclose or suggest transmitting a first data word from the storage device (i.e., the smart card) to the terminal (i.e., the in-vehicle unit (IVU)) before an interrupt sensitive time period, as required by claim 8. Instead, Chaum refers only to the data communication between the IVU and roadside collection station (RCS), which is

initiated by an initial “commit” data package. Indeed, there is no reference by Chaum to a data communication between the smart card and the IVU.

Additionally, Chaum does not disclose or suggest transmitting a particular signal from the terminal (i.e., the IVU) to the storage device (i.e., the smart card), the particular signal including a posting triggering signal, a posting data record, and an identifier generated using a first data word transmitted by the integrated circuit card before an interrupt-sensitive period and the second data word of at least one data word generated by either a computer or terminal in a secure, wireless communication with each other, as provided for in the context of claim 8. Again, there is no reference by Chaum to a data communication between the smart card and the IVU.

Furthermore, Chaum does not disclose or suggest transmitting a confirmation signal and further data from the storage device to the terminal and via the terminal to the computer, as also required by claim 8. Instead, Chaum states that the toll amount is debited from the smart card and a “payment” data package is generated by the IVU via the smart card, which is transmitted from the IVU to the RCS. (See col. 16, lines 53 to 65). In this regard, Chaum does not disclose or suggest a confirmation signal from the smart card to the IVU.

Hoshino does not cure the foregoing deficiencies of Chaum. Indeed, the assertion by the Office that “Hoshino teaches on data word constantly changing” (which is not conceded) merely addresses a very limited aspect of claim 8, which cannot adequately address Chaum’s numerous and extensive deficiencies. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Chaum and Hoshino does not render claim 8 unpatentable.

As regards to claims 9 and 11 to 17, which ultimately depend from claim 8 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 8, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Chaum and Hoshino does not render these dependent claims unpatentable for at least the same reasons given above in support of the patentability of claim 8.

For at least the reasons discussed above, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 8, 9 and 11 to 17 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Dated: 5 Dec 2006

Respectfully submitted, (reg. no. 36098)
By: Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646